arXiv:1507.06921v2 [math.DG] 1 Mar 2016

PROPER QUASI-HOMOGENEOUS DOMAINS IN FLAG MANIFOLDS AND GEOMETRIC STRUCTURES

ANDREW ZIMMER

Abstract. In this paper we study domains in flag manifolds which are bounded in an affine chart and whose projective automorphism group acts co-compactly. In contrast to the many examples in real projective space, we will show that no examples exist in many flag manifolds. Moreover, in the cases where such can domains exist, we show that they satisfy a natural convexity condition and have an invariant metric which generalizes the Hilbert metric. As an application we give some restrictions on the developing map for certain (G, X)-structures.

1. Introduction

Suppose G is a connected semi-simple Lie group with trivial center and without compact factors. If $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup then G acts by diffeomorphisms on the compact manifold G/P. Given an open set $\Omega \subset G/P$ we define the *automorphism group of* Ω to be

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) = \{g \in G : g\Omega = \Omega\}.$$

An open set $\Omega \subset G/P$ is called *quasi-homogeneous* if $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) \cdot K = \Omega$ for some compact subset $K \subset \Omega$. This paper is concerned with the geometry and classification of quasi-homogeneous domains.

1.1. (G, X)-structures.

One of main motivations for studying quasi-homogeneous domains comes from the theory of geometric structures on compact manifolds.

Suppose G is a Lie group acting transitively on a manifold X. A (G, X)-*structure* on a manifold M is an open cover $M = \cup_\alpha U_\alpha$ along with coordinate charts $\varphi_\alpha : U_\alpha \rightarrow X$ such that the transition functions $\varphi_\alpha \circ \varphi_\beta^{-1}$ coincide with the restriction of an element in G on $\varphi_\beta(U_\beta \cap U_\alpha)$.

Given a (G, X)-structure on a manifold M, one can "unfold" the structure to obtain a local diffeomorphism $\mathrm{dev} : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow X$ from the universal cover $\widetilde{M}$ of M to X called the *developing map* and a homomorphism $\mathrm{hol} : \pi_1(M, m) \rightarrow G$ called the *holonomy map*. The map dev will be hol-equivariant and when dev is a diffeomorphism onto its image we can identify M with $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$ where $\Gamma = \mathrm{hol}(\pi_1(M, m))$ and $\Omega = \mathrm{dev}(\widetilde{M})$. Complete details for the construction of these maps can be found in [Gol88].

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.
E-mail address: `aazimmer@uchicago.edu`.

Date: March 2, 2016.
Key words and phrases. Real projective manifolds, geometric structures, Kobayashi metric, Carathéodory metric, parabolic subgroups, projective automorphism group.

When M is closed, the group $\operatorname{hol}(\pi_1(M,m))$ acts co-compactly on $\operatorname{dev}(\widetilde{M})$ and thus $\operatorname{dev}(\widetilde{M})$ is a quasi-homogeneous domain in X. Our results about quasi-homogeneous domains will imply the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose M is a closed manifold, G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center, and $P \leq G$ is a non-maximal parabolic subgroup. If $\{(U_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a $(G, G/P)$-structure on M, then the image of the developing map cannot be bounded in an affine chart.*

Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.5 below.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose M is a closed manifold, G is a connected semi-simple Lie group with trivial center and no compact factors, and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. If $\{(U_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is a $(G, G/P)$-structure on M and the image of the developing map is bounded in an affine chart, then* $\operatorname{dev} : \widetilde{M} \to \operatorname{dev}(\widetilde{M})$ *is a covering map.*

In Proposition 7.1 below, we will show that when Ω is bounded in an affine chart the group $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on Ω. Using this fact it is straightforward to establish Theorem 1.2, see Section 8 for details.

1.2. **Proper domains.** Our approach to understanding quasi-homogeneous domains is inspired by the theory of convex divisible domains in real projective space (see for instance [Ben08]) and the theory of the bi-holomorphism group of bounded domains in complex Euclidean space (see for instance [IK99]). Motivated by these two settings we restrict our attention to a certain class of open sets:

Definition 1.3. An open set $\Omega \subset G/P$ is called a *proper domain* if it is connected and bounded in an affine chart of G/P.

As the next example shows certain symmetric spaces give rise to homogeneous proper domains:

Example 1.4. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be either the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$, the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$, or the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$. If $G = \operatorname{PGL}_d(\mathbb{K})$ and $P \leq \operatorname{PGL}_d(\mathbb{K})$ is a parabolic subgroup then P is the stabilizer of some $\mathbb{K}$-flag and G/P can be identified with a flag manifold. In the particular case when P is a maximal parabolic subgroup of G, then P is the stabilizer some p-plane in $\mathbb{K}^{p+q}$. Then we can identify G/P with $\operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{K}^{p+q})$ the Grassmanian of p-planes in $\mathbb{K}^{p+q}$. Let $M_{p+q,p}(\mathbb{K})$ be the space of $(p+q)$-by-p matrices with entries in $\mathbb{K}$. We can then identify the quotient manifold

$$\left\{A \in M_{(p+q),p}(\mathbb{K}) : \operatorname{rank} A = p\right\} / \operatorname{GL}_p(\mathbb{K})$$

with $\operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{K}^{p+q})$ via $A \to \operatorname{Im}(A)$. Then

$$\mathbb{A} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Id}_p \\ X \end{bmatrix} : X \in M_{q,p}(\mathbb{K}) \right\} \subset \operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{K}^{p+q}).$$

is an affine chart of $\operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{K}^{p+q})$ and so the open set

$$\mathcal{B}_{p,q} := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Id}_p \\ X \end{bmatrix} : \|X\| < 1 \right\} \subset \operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{K}^{p+q})$$

is a proper domain. Next let $\operatorname{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(p,q) \leq \operatorname{GL}_d(\mathbb{K})$ be the group which preserves the form

$$\overline{x}_1 y_1 + \cdots + \overline{x}_p y_p - \overline{x}_{p+1} y_{p+1} - \cdots - \overline{x}_{p+q} y_{p+q}.$$

Then $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{B}_{p,q})$ coincides with $\mathrm{PU}_{\mathbb{K}}(p,q)$, the image of $\mathrm{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(p,q)$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{K})$. Moreover $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{B}_{p,q})$ acts acts transitively on $\mathcal{B}_{p,q}$ and the stabilizer of $\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_p & 0 \end{bmatrix}^t$ is the group $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(p) \times \mathrm{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(q))$, so we can identify

$$\mathcal{B}_{p,q} \cong \mathrm{PU}_{\mathbb{K}}(p,q)/\,\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(p) \times \mathrm{U}_{\mathbb{K}}(q)).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{B}_{p,q}$ is a geometric model of the symmetric space associated to $\mathrm{PU}_{\mathbb{K}}(p,q)$. When $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ and $q = 1$, this is the Klein-Beltrami model of real hyperbolic p-space.

1.3. **Non-maximal parabolic subgroups.** In contrast to the above example, our main rigidity result shows that many flag manifolds have no quasi-homogenous proper domains:

Theorem 1.5. *(see Section 6 below) Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a non-maximal parabolic subgroup. If $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper domain then* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ *cannot act co-compactly on* Ω*.*

Remark 1.6.

(1) The theorem fails for general semi-simple groups. Take for instance $G = \mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R})$ and let $P \leq \mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R})$ be the stabilizer of some p-plane. Then we can identify $(G \times G)/(P \times P)$ with $\mathrm{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{p+q}) \times \mathrm{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{p+q})$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_{p,q} \times \mathcal{B}_{p,q} \subset \mathrm{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{p+q}) \times \mathrm{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{p+q})$$

is a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. Notice that the parabolic subgroup $P \times P$ is non-maximal: it is contained in $\mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R}) \times P$ and $P \times \mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R})$.

(2) There are examples of non-proper quasi-homogeneous domains: suppose $G = \mathrm{PGL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R})$ and $P \leq G$ is the stabilizer of a p-plane in $\mathbb{K}^{p+q}$. Then, by Example 1.4, there exists a proper homogeneous domain $\Omega \subset G/P$. Now consider a parabolic subgroup $P' \subsetneqq P$ and the natural projection map $\pi : G/P' \to G/P$. Then $\pi^{-1}(\Omega)$ is a homogeneous domain in G/P' which is not proper (see Proposition 4.5 below).

(3) Theorem 1.5 should be compared to the rich theory of *convex divisible domains* in real projective space. A proper convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is called *divisible* when there exists a discrete group $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ which acts co-compactly, freely, and properly on Ω. The symmetric domain $\mathcal{B}_{d,1}$ defined in Example 1.4 is the fundamental example of a convex divisible domain but there are many non-homogeneous examples, see the survey papers by Benoist [Ben08], Marquis [Mar13], and Quint [Qui10].

(4) We should also mention recent constructions [GW08, GW12, GGKW15b, KLP13, KLP14b, KLP14a] of open domains Ω in certain flag manifolds where there exists a discrete group $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ which acts properly, freely, and cocompactly on Ω. These constructions use the theory of Anosov representations and (to the best of our knowledge) never produce proper domains.

1.4. **The general semisimple case.** Suppose G is a connected semisimple Lie group with trivial center and no compact factors. Then there exists $G_1, \dots, G_r$

non-compact simple Lie groups each with trivial centers so that

$$G \cong \prod_{i=1}^{r} G_i.$$

Now if $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup we can find subgroups $P_i \leq G_i$ so that $P \cong \prod_{i=1}^{r} P_i$. Moreover, either $P_i = G_i$ or $P_i \leq G_i$ is a parabolic subgroup.

Theorem 1.7. *(see Section 7 below) With the notation above, suppose $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. Then for $1 \leq i \leq r$ there exists a proper quasi-homogeneous domain $\Omega_i \subset G_i/P_i$ so that $\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \Omega_i$. In particular, for $1 \leq i \leq r$ either $P_i = G_i$ or P_i is a maximal parabolic subgroup of G_i.*

This theorem reduces the study of quasi-homogeneous domains to the case when G is simple.

1.5. **The geometry of quasi-homogeneous domains.**

Kobayashi proved the following theorem connecting symmetry with convexity for domains in real projective space:

Theorem 1.8. [Kob77] *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a quasi-homogeneous proper domain then Ω is convex.*

In real projective space, one usually defines convexity using projective lines: a domain is convex if its intersection with every projective line is connected. However there is a dual definition: a connected open set Ω is convex if and only if for every $x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a hyperplane H such that $x \in H$ and $H \cap \Omega = \emptyset$.

This dual definition generalizes in a natural way to flag manifolds. Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Fix a parabolic subgroup Q opposite to P. Then for $\xi = hQ \in G/Q$ define the subset $Z_\xi \subset G/P$ by

$$Z_\xi := \{gP \in G/P : gPg^{-1} \text{ is not transverse to } hQh^{-1}\}.$$

Remark 1.9.

1. This definition does not depend on the choice of Q: if $Q_1, Q_2 \leq G$ are parabolic subgroups both opposite to a parabolic subgroup $P \leq G$ then Q_1 and Q_2 are conjugate. In particular, for any $\xi_1 \in Q_1$ there exists $\xi_2 \in Q_2$ so that $Z_{\xi_1} = Z_{\xi_2}$.
2. Notice that $G/P - Z_\xi$ is an affine chart of G/P, see Subsection 4.2.

Example 1.10. Again let $\mathbb{K}$ be either the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$, the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$, or the quaternions $\mathbb{H}$. Let $e_1, \dots, e_d$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{K}^d$ and let $P \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{K})$ be the stabilizer of the line $\mathbb{K}\, e_1$. Then $P \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is parabolic and G/P can be identified with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^d)$. If $Q \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the stabilizer of $\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{K}}(e_2, \dots, e_d)$, then Q is a parabolic subgroup opposite to P. Moreover we can identify G/Q with $\mathrm{Gr}_{d-1}(\mathbb{K}^d)$. With these identifications, if $\xi \in \mathrm{Gr}_{d-1}(\mathbb{K}^d)$ then Z_ξ is the image of the hypersurface ξ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{K}^d)$.

Now motivated by the hyperplane definition of convexity in real projective space we define:

Definition 1.11. Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. An open connected set $\Omega \subset G/P$

is called *dual convex* if for each $x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a parabolic subgroup Q opposite to P and some $\xi \in G/Q$ so that $x \in Z_\xi$ and $Z_\xi \cap \Omega = \emptyset$.

We will prove the following generalization of Kobayashi's theorem:

Theorem 1.12. *(see Corollary 9.3 below) Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. If $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a quasi-homogeneous proper domain then Ω is dual convex.*

Remark 1.13. Example 1.10 shows that for open connected sets in real projective space, dual convexity is equivalent to the standard definition of convexity. Dual convexity also generalizes a notion of convexity from several complex variables. In particular, an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ is often called *weakly linearly convex* if for each point $x \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a complex hyperplane H such that $x \in H$ and $H \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Surprisingly, this weak form of convexity has strong analytic implications. See [APS04, Hör07] for more details.

1.6. **An invariant metric.**

Every proper convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ has a metric H_Ω called the *Hilbert metric* which is complete, geodesic, and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant. This metric is a useful tool understanding the geometry of domains with large projective symmetry groups.

We will show that a proper dual convex domain in a flag manifold always has an complete $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant metric which is a natural analogue of the Hilbert metric. In particular:

Theorem 1.14. *Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. If $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper dual convex domain then there exists an $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant complete metric C_Ω which generates the standard topology on Ω.*

Remark 1.15.

1. The metric C_Ω can also be seen as a natural analogue of the Carathéodory metric from several complex variables.
2. For "linearly convex" domains in complex projective space C_Ω was introduced by Dubois [Dub09] and used in [Zim15] to provide several characterizations of the unit ball.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Lizhen Ji, Wouter van Limbeek, and Ralf Spatzier for many interesting discussions. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Number NSF 1400919.

2. EXAMPLES AND RIGIDITY OF PROPER QUASI-HOMOGENEOUS DOMAINS

In this section we describe some examples of proper quasi-homogeneous domains.

2.1. **The symmetric case.**

The Borel embedding shows that every non-compact Hermitian symmetric space X embeds as a domain Ω_X into a flag manifold G/P (and this flag manifold can be identified with the compact dual of X) so that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_X) = \mathrm{Isom}_0(X)$. The image of this embedding will be a proper domain.

More generally, Nagano [Nag65, Theorem 6.1] has characterized all the non-compact symmetric spaces X whose compact dual X^* can be identified with a flag manifold G/P and X embeds as a domain Ω_X into G/P so that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_X) =$

$\mathrm{Isom}_0(X)$. In all these examples the images are proper domains [Nag65, Theorem 6.2]

There also exists examples of symmetric spaces which embed into real projective space as a proper domain. In particular, the symmetric spaces associated to $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{C})$, $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{H})$, and $E_{6(-26)}$ can all be realized as a proper homogeneous domains in a real projective space. For instance, consider the convex set

$$\mathcal{P} = \{[X] \in \mathbb{P}(S_{d,d}) : X \text{ is positive definite}\}$$

where $S_{d,d}$ is the vector space of real symmetric d-by-d matrices. Then the group $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{P}$ by $g \cdot [X] = [gXg^t]$ and the stabilizer of a point is $\mathrm{SO}(d)$. So we have an identification

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{SO}(d).$$

There does not appear to be a general classification of embeddings of symmetric spaces into flag manifolds.

Problem 2.1. Characterize the symmetric spaces X which embed as a proper domain Ω_X into a flag manifold where $\mathrm{Isom}_0(X) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_X)$.

2.2. **Real projective space.**

Beyond the examples mentioned in the subsection above, there are a rich class of proper domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ contains a discrete group Γ which acts cocompactly on Ω. By a result of Kobayashi (Theorem 1.8 above) these examples will alway be convex and are often called *convex divisible domains*. Here are some examples:

1. Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be the Klein-Beltrami model of $\mathbb{H}^d_{\mathbb{R}}$. Results of Johnson-Millson [JM87] and Koszul [Kos68] imply that the domain $\mathcal{B}$ can be deformed to a divisible convex domain Ω where $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is discrete (see [Ben00, Section 1.3] for $d > 2$ and [Gol90] for $d = 2$).
2. For every $d \geq 4$, Kapovich [Kap07] has constructed divisible convex domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is discrete, Gromov hyperbolic, and not quasi-isometric to any symmetric space,.
3. Benoist [Ben06] and Ballas, Danciger, and Lee [BDL15] have constructed divisible convex domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is discrete, not Gromov hyperbolic, and not quasi-isometric to any symmetric space.

More background can be found in the survey papers by Benoist [Ben08], Marquis [Mar13], and Quint [Qui10].

2.3. **Complex projective space.**

As Example 1.4 shows, there exists a proper homogeneous domain $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ (which is a model of complex hyperbolic space, see for instance [Mos73, Chapter 19]).

In $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ there do exist non-homogeneous proper domains which admit a co-compact action by a discrete group in $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. However if $\partial\Omega$ has very weak regularity then a result of Bowen implies that Ω must be a symmetric domain:

Theorem 2.2. [Bow79] *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ *is a proper domain and* $\partial\Omega$ *is a Jordan curve with Hausdorff dimension one. If there exists a discrete group* $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ *which acts co-compactly on* Ω *then* Ω *is projectively isomorphic to* $\mathcal{B}$.

In $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^3)$ the co-compact case is even more rigid and recent work of Cano and Seade implies the following:

Theorem 2.3. [CS14] *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^3)$ *is a proper domain and* $\Gamma \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ *is a discrete group which acts co-compactly on* Ω*. Then* Ω *is projectively isomorphic to* $\mathcal{B}$*.*

It is worth noting that Cano and Seade's proof relies on Kobayashi and Ochiai's [KO80] classification of compact complex surfaces with a projective structure. In particular, it is unclear if Cano and Seade's result should extend to higher dimensions. However, it is known that every proper quasi-homogeneous domain with C^1 boundary is symmetric:

Theorem 2.4. [Zim15] *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{d+1})$ *is a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. If* $\partial\Omega$ *is* C^1 *then* Ω *is projectively isomorphic to* $\mathcal{B}$*.*

2.4. **Rigidity and convexity.** The embeddings of symmetric spaces mentioned in Subsection 2.1 are always convex in some affine chart, see for instance [Nag65, Theorem 6.2]. Thus it seems natural to consider proper quasi-homogeneous domains which are convex in some affine chart. In particular, we say a domain $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a *convex divisible domain* if Ω is a bounded open convex set of some affine chart and there exists a discrete group $\Gamma \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ which acts properly discontinuously, freely, and co-compactly on Ω.

For some flag manifolds there are no non-homogeneous convex divisible domains. Frankel proved the following:

Theorem 2.5. [Fra89] *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ *is a bounded convex open set and there exists a discrete group* Γ *of bi-holomorphic maps of* Ω *which acts properly discontinuously, freely, and co-compactly on* Ω*. Then* Ω *is a bounded symmetric domain.*

Thus if G/P has a complex structure so that G acts on G/P homomorphically we see that the only convex divisible domains in G/P are homogeneous. Frankel's proof uses many techniques from several complex variables and does not extend to domains in a general flag manifold. However in the special case of $\operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{2p})$ the following is known:

Theorem 2.6. [vLZ15] *Suppose* $p > 1$ *and* $\Omega \subset \operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{2p})$ *is a convex divisible domain. Then* Ω *is projectively isomorphic to* $\mathcal{B}_{p,p}$*.*

Based on these examples we conjecture (see also Conjecture 1.7 in [vLZ15]):

Conjecture 2.7. Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. If G/P is not isomorphic to a real projective space or the complex projective plane then every convex divisible domain in G/P is homogeneous.

3. THE AUTOMORPHISM GROUP IS CLOSED

It will be useful in what follows to know the automorphism group of an open domain is always closed.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose* G *is a connected semisimple Lie group with finite center. If* $P \leq G$ *is a parabolic subgroup and* $\Omega \subset P/G$ *is a open set, then* $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega) \leq G$ *is closed.*

Proof. Fix a distance d on G/P which is induced by a Riemannian metric. Suppose that a sequence $\varphi_n \in \operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ converges to some $\varphi \in G$. Now since

$$\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset G$$

is relatively compact, there exists some $K \geq 1$ so that

$$\frac{1}{K} d(x,y) \leq d(\varphi_n x, \varphi_n y) \leq K d(x,y)$$

for all $x, y \in G/P$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Next define the function $\delta_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by

$$\delta_\Omega(x) = \inf\{d(x,y) : y \in G/P - \Omega\}.$$

Now fix $x \in \Omega$, then $\delta_\Omega(\varphi_n x) \geq \frac{1}{K}\delta_\Omega(x)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So $\delta_\Omega(\varphi x) \geq \frac{1}{K}\delta_\Omega(x)$. Thus $\varphi x \in \Omega$. Since $x \in \Omega$ was arbitrary we see that $\varphi(\Omega) \subset \Omega$. Applying the same argument to the sequence $\varphi_n^{-1} \rightarrow \varphi^{-1}$ we see that $\varphi^{-1}(\Omega) \subset \Omega$. Thus $\varphi(\Omega) = \Omega$ and so $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. □

4. Parabolic subgroups

For the rest of this section suppose that G is a connected semisimple Lie group without compact factors and with trivial center. Let $K \leq G$ be a maximal compact subgroup. Then the manifold $X = G/K$ has a G-invariant non-positively curved Riemannian metric g and (X, g) is a symmetric space.

Let $X(\infty)$ be the ideal boundary of X. For a geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ let

$$\gamma(\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t) \in X(\infty)$$

and

$$\gamma(-\infty) = \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma(t) \in X(\infty).$$

Definition 4.1.

1. A subgroup $P \leq G$ is called *parabolic* if P is the stabilizer in G of some point $x \in X(\infty)$.
2. Two parabolic subgroups $P, Q \leq G$ are said to be *opposite* if there exists a geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ so that P is the stabilizer of $\gamma(\infty)$ and Q is the stabilizer of $\gamma(-\infty)$.

In this section we recall the basic properties of parabolic subgroups. We will mostly rely on the exposition in Eberlein's book on symmetric spaces [Ebe96] and Warner's book on harmonic analysis on semi-simple groups [War72].

Theorem 4.2. *With the notation above,*

1. *There are only finitely many conjugacy classes of parabolic subgroups.*
2. *Suppose $P, Q_1, Q_2 \leq G$ are parabolic subgroups. If Q_1, Q_2 are both opposite to P then there exists some $p \in P$ so that $pQ_1p^{-1} = Q_2$.*

Proof. For the first assertion see Corollary 2.17.23 in [Ebe96]. The idea is: fix a maximal flat F in X, then given a geodesic $\gamma : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ there exists $g \in G$ so that $g\gamma \subset F$. Then using the root space decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ associated to F, one shows that only finitely many different groups arise as stabilizers of points $x \in F(\infty)$.

Next suppose that Q_1, Q_2 are both opposite to P. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\gamma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ be a geodesic where P is the stabilizer of $\gamma_i(\infty)$ and Q_i is the stabilizer of $\gamma_i(-\infty)$. Since P acts transitively on X (see Proposition 2.17.1 in [Ebe96]), there exists $p \in P$ so that $p\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$. Then pQ_1p^{-1} is the stabilizer of $p\gamma_1(-\infty)$. Now since P is the stabilizer of $p\gamma_1(\infty)$ and $\gamma_2(\infty)$, Proposition 2.17.15 in [Ebe96] implies that $d(p)\gamma_1'(0)$ and $\gamma_2'(0)$ are in the same Weyl Chamber W in $S_{\gamma_2(0)}X$ (the unit tangent bundle of X above $\gamma_2(0)$). Finally, since $-W \subset S_{\gamma_2(0)}X$ is also a Weyl chamber we see that $-d(p)\gamma_1'(0)$ and $-\gamma_2'(0)$ are also in the same Weyl chamber. So appealing to Proposition 2.17.15 in [Ebe96] again, we see that $pQ_1p^{-1} = Q_2$. ☐

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose $P, Q \leq G$ are opposite parabolic subgroups. Then gPg^{-1} and hQh^{-1} are opposite if and only if $g^{-1}h \in PQ$.*

Proof. Clearly gPg^{-1} and hQh^{-1} are opposite if and only if P and $(g^{-1}h)Q(g^{-1}h)^{-1}$ are opposite. But by Theorem 4.2 this happens if and only if $pg^{-1}hQ(pg^{-1}h)^{-1} = Q$ for some $p \in P$. But parabolic subgroups are their own normalizer, see Proposition 2.17.25 in [Ebe96], and so this happens if and only if $g^{-1}h \in PQ$. ☐

Since $PQ \subset G$ is open and dense (see for instance [War72, Proposition 1.2.4.10]), we immediately see that:

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose $P, Q \leq G$ are opposite parabolic subgroups. Then the set*

$$\mathcal{O} := \left\{(gP, hQ) : gPg^{-1} \text{ and } hQh^{-1} \text{ are opposite}\right\} \subset G/P \times G/Q$$

is open and dense.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose $P, Q \leq G$ are opposite parabolic subgroups. If $P_0 \gneqq P$ is a parabolic subgroup, then there exists a unique parabolic subgroup $Q_0 \gneqq Q$ so that P_0 and Q_0 are opposite. Moreover,*

1. *If gPg^{-1} and hQh^{-1} are opposite then gP_0g^{-1} and hQ_0h^{-1} are opposite.*
2. *There exists $w \in P_0$ so that wPw^{-1} and Q are not opposite.*

Proof. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to X$ be a geodesic so that P is the stabilizer of $\gamma(\infty)$ and Q is the stabilizer of $\gamma(-\infty)$. Let F be a maximal flat containing γ. Pick $x \in X(\infty)$ so that P_0 is the stabilizer of $x \in X(\infty)$. Then $x \in F(\infty)$ by Proposition 3.6.26 in [Ebe96]. Now using Proposition 2.17.13 in [Ebe96] we see that there exists a parabolic subgroup $Q_0 \geq Q$ so that P_0 and Q_0 are opposite. Moreover, if $Q_1 \geq Q$ is a parabolic subgroup and Q_1 is the stabilizer of $y \in X(\infty)$ then, by Proposition 3.6.26 in [Ebe96] again, $y \in F(\infty)$. So using Proposition 2.17.13 in [Ebe96] again we see that Q_0 is unique.

By Corollary 4.3, if gPg^{-1} and hQh^{-1} are opposite then $g^{-1}h \in PQ$ then $g^{-1}h \in P_0Q_0$ then $gP'g^{-1}$ and $hQ'h^{-1}$ are opposite.

As before let F be a maximal flat containing γ. Then $F(\infty)$ decomposes into Weyl chambers and if P_z is the stabilizer of $z \in F(\infty)$ then P_z is opposite to Q if and only if z and $\gamma(\infty)$ are in the same Weyl chamber (by Proposition 2.17.13 in [Ebe96]). Let K be the stabilizer of $\gamma(0)$ and let

$$W = \{k \in K : kF = F\}.$$

Now by Lemma 1.2.4.6 in [War72] there exists $w \in W \cap P_0$ so that $w\gamma(\infty)$ is not in the same Weyl chamber as $\gamma(\infty)$. Hence wPw^{-1} is not opposite to Q. ☐

4.1. Representations.

Using the theory of irreducible representations of reductive groups Guéritaud et al. [GGKW15a, Lemma 4.5, Proposition 4.6] proved the the following theorem:

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose $P, Q \leq G$ are opposite parabolic subgroups. Then there exists an real vector space V, an irreducible representation $\tau : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V)$, a line $\ell \subset V$, and a hyperplane $H \subset V$ so that:*

1. $\ell + H = V$.

(2) *The stabilizer of* ℓ *in* G *is* P *and the stabilizer of* H *in* G *is* Q*.*
(3) gPg^{-1} *and* hQh^{-1} *are opposite if and only if* $\tau(g)\ell$ *and* $\tau(g)H$ *are transverse.*

Now fix $P, Q \leq G$ opposite parabolic subgroups. Let $\tau : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be an irreducible representation, $\ell \subset V$ a line, and $H \subset V$ a hyperplane as in Theorem 4.6. Fix some $x_0 \in V$ so that $\mathbb{R}\, x_0 = \ell$ and fix some $f_0 \in V^*$ a functional with $\ker f_0 = H$. Consider the dual representation $\tau^* : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V^*)$. Now define the maps $\iota : G/P \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $\iota^* : G/Q \to \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ by

$$\iota(gP) = [\tau(g)x_0] \text{ and } \iota^*(gQ) = [\tau^*(g)f_0].$$

It will be helpful to observe the following:

Observation 4.7. With the notation above, if $\mathcal{O} \subset G/P$ is any open set then there exists $x_1, \dots, x_D \in \mathcal{O}$ so that

$$\iota(x_1) + \cdots + \iota(x_D) = V.$$

Analogously, if $\mathcal{O} \subset G/Q$ is any open set then there exists $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_D \in \mathcal{O}$ so that

$$\iota^*(\xi_1) + \cdots + \iota^*(\xi_D) = V^*.$$

Proof. We can identify V with $\mathbb{R}^D$. Consider the map $\Phi : G^D \to \wedge^D \mathbb{R}^D$ given by

$$\Phi(g_1, \dots, g_D) = (\tau(g_1)x_0) \wedge (\tau(g_2)x_0) \wedge \cdots \wedge (\tau(g_D)x_0).$$

Since τ is an irreducible representation there exists $(g_1, \dots, g_D) \in G^D$ so that $\Phi(g_1, \dots, g_D) \neq 0$. Then since Φ is real analytic for any open set $\mathcal{O} \subset G^D$ there exists $(h_1, \dots, h_D) \in \mathcal{O}$ so that $\Phi(h_1, \dots, h_D) \neq 0$. This implies the first assertion of the Proposition. The second assertion has the exact same proof. ☐

4.2. **Affine charts.**

Definition 4.8. Suppose that $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Then a non-empty subset $\mathbb{A} \subset G/P$ is called an *affine chart* if there exists a parabolic subgroup $Q \leq G$ so that

$$\mathbb{A} = \{x = gP \in G/P : gPg^{-1} \text{ is opposite to } Q\}.$$

Let $P, Q \leq G$ be opposite parabolic subgroups. Let $N \leq Q$ be the unipotent radical of Q, then $QP = NP$ by Proposition 2.17.5 and 2.17.13 in [Ebe96]. Now suppose $\mathbb{A} \subset G/P$ is an affine chart and

$$\mathbb{A} = \{x = gP \in G/P : gPg^{-1} \text{ is opposite to } Q'\}$$

for some parabolic subgroup $Q' \leq G$. Since $\mathbb{A}$ is non-empty, $g_0P \in \mathbb{A}$ for some $g_0 \in G$. So P is opposite to $g_0^{-1}Q'g_0$. Now by Theorem 4.2, $g_0^{-1}Q'g_0 = pQp^{-1}$ for some $p \in P$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{A} &= (g_op)^{-1}\{gP \in G/P : gPg^{-1} \text{ is opposite to } Q\} \\ &= (g_op)^{-1}\{gP \in G/P : g \in QP\} \\ &= (g_0p)^{-1}NP.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, an affine chart in G/P is a translate of the Bruhat big cell.

5. A Carathéodory type metric

Suppose G is a non-compact connected simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Fix a parabolic subgroup $Q \leq G$ opposite to P.

Given a set $\Omega \subset G/P$ define

$$\Omega^* := \{\xi \in G/Q : \xi \text{ is opposite to every } x \in \Omega\}.$$

Also given $\xi \in G/Q$ define (as before)

$$Z_\xi := \{x \in G/P : x \text{ is not opposite to } \xi\}.$$

Then $\xi \in \Omega^*$ if and only if $Z_\xi \cap \Omega = \emptyset$.

Observation 5.1.

1. If Ω is open then Ω^* is compact.
2. Ω is bounded in an affine chart if and only Ω^* has non-empty interior.

Proof. Suppose that Ω is open and ξ_n is a sequence in Ω^* converging to some $\xi \in G/Q$. Suppose for a contradiction that $\xi \notin \Omega^*$. Then there is some $x \in \Omega$ so that x is not opposite to ξ. Since $\xi_n \to \xi$, we can find $g_n \in G$ converging to e so that $g_n \xi = \xi_n$. Then ξ_n is not opposite to $g_n x$. But since $g_n \to e$ and Ω is open, we see that $g_n x \in \Omega$ for large n. So we have a contradiction.

Now suppose that Ω is bounded in some affine chart $\mathbb{A} \subset G/P$. Then $\mathbb{A} = G/P - Z_\eta$ for some $\eta \in G/Q$. Since Ω is bounded in $\mathbb{A}$,

$$\overline{\Omega} \cap Z_\eta = \emptyset.$$

Suppose for a contradiction that η is not in the interior of Ω^*. Then there exists $\eta_n \in G/Q$ so that $\eta_n \to \eta$ and $x_n \in \Omega$ so that x_n is not opposite to η_n. By passing to a subsequence we can suppose that $x_n \to x \in \overline{\Omega}$. But then, by Corollary 4.4, we see that x is not opposite to η which is a contradiction.

Now suppose that η is in the interior of Ω^*. Since $\eta \in \Omega^*$ we see that Ω is contained in the affine chart $\mathbb{A} = G/P - Z_\eta$. Now fix an neighborhood U of the identity in G so that $U\eta \subset \Omega^*$. Then

$$\Omega \cap (U \cdot Z_\eta) = \emptyset$$

and $U \cdot Z_\eta$ is a neighborhood of Z_η. Thus Ω is bounded in $\mathbb{A}$. □

Let $\tau : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be an irreducible representation, $\ell \subset V$ a line, and $H \subset V$ a hyperplane as in Theorem 4.6. Fix some $x_0 \in V$ so that $\mathbb{R}\, x_0 = \ell$ and fix some $f_0 \in V^*$ with $\ker f_0 = H$. Consider the dual representation $\tau^* : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V^*)$. Now define the maps $\iota : G/P \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $\iota^* : G/Q \to \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ by

$$\iota(gP) = [\tau(g)x_0] \text{ and } \iota^*(gQ) = [\tau^*(g)f_0].$$

Then for a proper domain $\Omega \subset G/P$ define the function

$$C_\Omega : \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

by

$$C_\Omega(x,y) = \sup_{\xi,\eta \in \Omega^*} \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \frac{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)}{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)} \right|.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper domain. Then C_Ω is a* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-*invariant metric on Ω which generates the standard topology.*

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ preserves Ω^* we see that C_Ω is $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant.

Fix $x, y \in \Omega$ distinct. We will show that $C_\Omega(x,y) > 0$. Since $\Omega^* \subset G/Q$ has non-empty interior, Observation 4.7 implies that the set $\iota^*(\Omega^*) \subset \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ contains a basis of V^*. So we can find a basis $f_1, \dots, f_D \in V^*$ so that $[f_1], \dots, [f_D] \in \iota^*(\Omega^*)$. Now let $e_1, \dots, e_d$ be the basis of V dual to $f_1, \dots, f_D$, that is

$$f_j(e_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\iota(x) = [\sum x_i e_i]$ and $\iota(y) = [\sum y_i e_i]$ for some $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\iota : G/P \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ is injective there exists i, j so that $x_i/x_j \neq y_i/y_j$. Then

$$C_\Omega(x,y) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left|\log\left|\frac{f_i(\iota(x))f_j(\iota(y))}{f_i(\iota(y))f_j(\iota(x))}\right|\right| = \frac{1}{2}\left|\log\left|\frac{x_i y_j}{x_j y_i}\right|\right| > 0.$$

Next fix $x, y, z \in \Omega$. Since Ω^* is compact there exists $\xi, \eta \in \Omega^*$ so that

$$C_\Omega(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)}{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)}\right|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_\Omega(x,y) &= \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(z)\Big)}{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(z)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(x)\Big)}\right| + \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(z)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)}{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(y)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(z)\Big)}\right|. \\ &\leq C_\Omega(x,z) + C_\Omega(z,y). \end{aligned}$$

So C_Ω satisfies the triangle inequality and hence is a metric.

It remains to show that C_Ω generates the standard topology. Since Ω^* is compact, C_Ω is continuous with respect to the standard topology on Ω. Thus to show that C_Ω generates the standard topology it is enough to show: for any $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $U \subset \Omega$ an open neighborhood of x_0 there exists $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\{y \in \Omega : C_\Omega(x_0, y) < \delta\} \subset U.$$

As before fix a basis $f_1, \dots, f_D \in V^*$ so that $[f_1], \dots, [f_D] \in \iota^*(\Omega^*)$. Then let $e_1, \dots, e_D$ be the basis of V dual to $f_1, \dots, f_D$. Suppose that

$$\iota(x_0) = \left[e_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{D} x_i e_i\right].$$

Since $[f_i] \in \Omega^*$, $x_i \neq 0$ and since $\iota(U)$ is open, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that

$$\left\{\left[e_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{D} y_i e_i\right] : e^{-\epsilon} < |x_i/y_i| < e^{\epsilon}\right\} \subset \iota(U).$$

Moreover, if $\iota(y) = \left[e_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{D} y_i e_i\right]$ then

$$C_\Omega(x,y) \geq \max_{2 \leq i \leq D} \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{x_i}{y_i}\right|.$$

So if $\delta = \epsilon/2$ we see that

$$\{y \in \Omega : C_\Omega(x_0, y) < \delta\} \subset U.$$

Thus C_Ω generates the standard topology. $\square$

The existence of an invariant metric implies the following:

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper domain. Then the action of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ *on Ω is proper.*

The proof of Corollary 5.3 is essentially the proof of [Zim15, Proposition 4.4] taken verbatim.

Proof. This argument requires some care because C_Ω may not be a complete metric. Fix a compact set $K \subset \Omega$, we claim that

$$\{\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) : \varphi K \cap K \neq \emptyset\} \subset \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$$

is compact. So suppose that $\varphi_n k_n \in K$ for some sequence $\varphi_n \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ and $k_n \in K$. By passing to a subsequence we can suppose that $k_n \to k \in K$. Now since C_Ω is a locally compact metric (it generates the standard topology) and $K \subset \Omega$ is compact there exists some $\delta > 0$ so that the set

$$K_1 = \{q \in \Omega : C_\Omega(K, q) \leq 2\delta\}$$

is compact. Next let

$$K_2 = \{q \in \Omega : C_\Omega(k, q) \leq \delta\}.$$

Then for large n we have $\varphi_n(K_2) \subset K_1$. Since φ_n preserves the metric C_Ω and $(K_1, C_\Omega|_{K_1})$ is a complete metric space we can pass to a subsequence and assume that $\varphi_n|_{K_2}$ converges uniformly to a function $f : K_2 \to K_1$. Moreover

$$C_\Omega(f(p_1), f(p_2)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} C_\Omega(\varphi_n p_1, \varphi_n p_2) = C_\Omega(p_1, p_2)$$

for all $p_1, p_2 \in K_2$. Since C_Ω is a metric generating the standard topology on Ω, we see that f induces a homeomorphism $K_2 \to f(K_2)$.

Since G is a simple Lie group, the map $\tau : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ is proper. Now fix a norm on V and an associated operator norm on $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. Next let $T_n \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be a representative of $\tau(\varphi_n)$ with $\|T_n\| = 1$. Then pass to a subsequence so that $T_n \to T$ in $\mathrm{End}(V)$. Now let $Y = (\iota)^{-1}(\ker T)$. Notice: if $x \in K_2 \cap (\Omega \setminus Y)$ then

$$\iota(f(x)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \iota(\varphi_n x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tau(\varphi_n)\iota(x) = T(\iota(x)).$$

Now by Observation 4.7, $\Omega \setminus Y$ is open and dense in Ω. So $K_2 \cap (\Omega \setminus Y)$ has non-empty interior, so

$$f\left(K_2 \cap (\Omega \setminus Y)\right)$$

has non-empty interior. But then by Observation 4.7, the image of T contains a spanning set of V. Thus $T \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$. Thus, since τ is a proper map, we can pass to a subsequence so that φ_n converges to some φ in G. Then since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is closed we see that $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. Thus the set

$$\{\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) : \varphi K \cap K \neq \emptyset\} \subset \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$$

is compact. So $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on Ω. □

5.1. **The Hilbert metric.** In this subsection we compare the metric C_Ω to the Hilbert metric.

An open set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called *properly convex* if for every projective line $\ell \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the intersection $\ell \cap \mathcal{C}$ is connected and $\overline{\ell \cap \mathcal{C}} \neq \ell$. Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is properly convex. Given two points $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ let ℓ_{xy} be a projective line containing x and y. Then the *Hilbert distance* between them is defined to be

$$H_{\mathcal{C}}(x,y) = \log \frac{|y-a|\,|x-b|}{|x-a|\,|y-b|}$$

where $\{a,b\} = \partial\mathcal{C} \cap \ell_{xy}$ and we have the ordering a, x, y, b along ℓ_{xy}. Now define

$$\mathcal{C}^{dual} = \{[f] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*}) : f(x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

By the supporting hyperplane definition of convexity, we see that every $a \in \partial\mathcal{C}$ is contained in the kernel of some $f \in \mathcal{C}^{dual}$. Then it is not hard to show that

$$H_{\mathcal{C}}(x,y) = \sup_{f,g \in \mathcal{C}^{dual}} \log \left| \frac{f(y)g(x)}{f(x)g(y)} \right|.$$

Let $e_1, \dots, e_d$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $P \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be the stabilizer of the line $\mathbb{R}\, e_1$ and $Q \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ the stabilizer of $\mathbb{R}\, e_2 + \dots + \mathbb{R}\, e_d$. Then P, Q are opposite parabolic subgroups. We can take $\tau : \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ to be the identity representation. Then ι identifies G/P with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and ι^* identifies G/Q with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$.

Suppose $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper dual convex domain. Then $\iota(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex set. Moreover,

$$\iota^*(\Omega^*) = \{f \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^*) : f(x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \iota(\Omega)\} = \iota(\Omega)^{dual}$$

Thus

$$C_\Omega(x,y) = H_{\iota(\Omega)}(\iota(x), \iota(y))$$

for all $x, y \in \Omega$.

5.2. **The Carathéodory and Kobayashi metric.** For domains $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which are not convex, Kobayashi [Kob77] constructed two invariant metrics using projective maps to and from the unit interval. Let

$$I := \{[1:x] : |x| < 1\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

For two open sets $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{R}^{d_1+1})$ and $\Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d_2+1})$ let $\mathrm{Proj}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ be the space of maps $f : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$ such that $f = T|_{\Omega_1}$ for some $T \in \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^{d_1+1}, \mathbb{R}^{d_2+1}))$ with $\ker T \cap \Omega_1 = \emptyset$.

For a domain $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ define the two quantities:

$$c_{\mathcal{O}}(x,y) = \sup\left\{H_I(f(x), f(y)) : f \in \mathrm{Proj}(\Omega, I)\right\},$$

and

$$L_{\mathcal{O}}(x,y) = \inf\left\{H_I(u,w) : f \in \mathrm{Proj}(I, \Omega) \text{ with } f(u) = x \text{ and } f(w) = y\right\}.$$

The function $c_{\mathcal{O}}$ always satisfies the triangle inequality, but $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ may not. So we introduce:

$$k_{\mathcal{O}}(x,y) = \inf\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{N} L_{\mathcal{O}}(x_i, x_{i+1}) : N > 0,\ x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{N+1} \in \mathcal{O},\ x = x_0,\ y = x_{N+1} \right\}.$$

Kobayashi then proved:

Proposition 5.4. [Kob77] *Suppose $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a proper domain. Then $c_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $k_{\mathcal{O}}$ are $\operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$-invariant metrics on $\mathcal{O}$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{O}$ is convex then $c_{\mathcal{O}} = k_{\mathcal{O}} = H_{\mathcal{O}}$.*

As in Subsection 5.1 let $G = \operatorname{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, P the stabilizer of $\mathbb{R}\, e_1$, Q the stabilizer of $\mathbb{R}\, e_2 + \cdots + \mathbb{R}\, e_d$, $\tau : \operatorname{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \to \operatorname{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ the identity representation, and ι, ι^* the induced maps.

Proposition 5.5. *With the notation above, suppose $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper domain. Then $C_\Omega(x,y) = c_{\iota(\Omega)}(\iota(x), \iota(y))$ for all $x, y \in \Omega$.*

Proof. View Ω as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and Ω^* as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$. Then for $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Omega^*$ distinct there is a unique map $T \in \mathbb{P}(\operatorname{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{R}^2))$ with $T^{-1}([1:-1]) = \ker \xi_1$ and $T^{-1}([1:1]) = \ker \xi_2$, and $T(\Omega) \subset I$. Then $f = T|_\Omega \in \operatorname{Proj}(\Omega, I)$ and it is straightforward to show that

$$\left| \log \left| \frac{\xi_1(x)\xi_2(y)}{\xi_1(y)\xi_2(x)} \right| \right| = H_I(f(x), f(y)).$$

Conversely, if $f = T|_\Omega \in \operatorname{Proj}(\Omega, I)$ then $T^{-1}([1:-1]) = \ker \xi_1$ and $T^{-1}([1:1]) = \ker \xi_2$ for some $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Omega^*$. Then as before

$$\left| \log \left| \frac{\xi_1(x)\xi_2(y)}{\xi_1(y)\xi_2(x)} \right| \right| = H_I(f(x), f(y)).$$

$\square$

This proposition shows that C_Ω can be seen as an analogue of the Carathéodory metric from several complex variables.

For certain flag manifolds G/P it is also possible to construct an invariant metric K_Ω using projective maps of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into G/P. See [vLZ15, Section 4] for the case when $G/P = \operatorname{Gr}_p(\mathbb{R}^{p+q})$.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.5

Assume for a contradiction that there exists G a non-compact connected simple Lie group with trivial center, $P \leq G$ a non-maximal parabolic subgroup, and $\Omega \subset G/P$ a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. Let $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact subset so that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega) \cdot K = \Omega$.

Fix some parabolic subgroup $P_0 \gneq P$. Next consider the natural projection $\pi : G/P \to G/P_0$. Let $\Omega_0 = \pi(\Omega)$. Since $\pi(gx) = g\pi(x)$ we see that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega) \leq \operatorname{Aut}(\Omega_0)$ and

$$\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega) \cdot \pi(K) = \pi(\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega) \cdot K) = \pi(\Omega) = \Omega_0.$$

Hence Ω_0 is quasi-homogeneous.

Next fix a parabolic subgroup $Q \leq G$ opposite to P. By Proposition 4.5 there exists a unique parabolic subgroup $Q_0 \geq Q$ which is opposite to P_0. As in Section 5 we can define domains $\Omega^* \subset G/Q$ and $\Omega_0^* \subset G/Q_0$. Moreover, if $\pi^* : G/Q \to G/Q_0$ is the natural projection, we see from Proposition 4.5 that $\pi^*(\Omega^*) \subset \Omega_0^*$. So Ω_0^* has non-empty interior and thus by Observation 5.1 we see that Ω_0 is a proper domain. Thus by Corollary 5.3 we see that $\operatorname{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on Ω_0.

Now fix some point $gP_0 \in \Omega_0$ and let

$$\Omega_g := \pi_1^{-1}(gP_0) \cap \Omega = gP_0/P \cap \Omega.$$

By Proposition 4.5 part (2) we can pick $z_n \in \Omega_g$ so that $z_n \to z \in \partial\Omega$. Next pick $\varphi_n \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ so that $z_n \in \varphi_n K$. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is closed and $z \in \partial\Omega$ we see that $\varphi_n \to \infty$ in G. Then

$$\varphi_n^{-1}(gP_0) = \pi(\varphi_n^{-1} z_n) \in \pi(K).$$

Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on Ω_0 we have a contradiction.

7. The general semisimple case

For the rest of this section, suppose G is a connected semisimple Lie group with trivial center and no compact factors, $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup, and $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper domain.

Then there exists $G_1, \dots, G_r$ non-compact simple Lie groups each with trivial centers so that

$$G \cong \prod_{i=1}^r G_i.$$

Now we can find parabolic subgroups $P_i \leq G_i$ so that $P \cong \prod_{i=1}^r P_i$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $P_i \neq G_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

For $1 \leq i \leq k$ let $\pi_i : G/P \to G_i/P_i$ and $\rho_i : G \to G_i$ be the natural projections. Next let $\Omega_i = \pi_i(\Omega)$. Then (by definition) Ω_i is a proper domain. Moreover, $\rho_i(\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)) \subset \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_i)$ and so Corollary 5.3 implies that $\rho_i(\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega))$ acts properly on Ω_i. Then since Ω is a subset of $\prod_{i=1}^r \Omega_i$:

Proposition 7.1. $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ *acts properly on* Ω*.*

We now prove Theorem 1.7:

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $K \subset \Omega$ be a compact subset so that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) \cdot K = \Omega$.

Next let

$$\widehat{\Omega} := \prod_{i=1}^k \Omega_i \subset G/P.$$

Since $\rho_i(\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega))$ acts properly on Ω_i we see that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \rho_i(\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega))$$

acts properly on $\widehat{\Omega}$. Then, since

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \rho_i(\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega))$$

we see that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on $\widehat{\Omega}$.

Now assume that $\Omega \neq \widehat{\Omega}$. Then there exists some $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \widehat{\Omega}$. Pick $x_n \in \Omega$ so that $x_n \to x$. Then there exists $\varphi_n \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ so that $x_n \in \varphi_n K$.

Let $K' \subset \widehat{\Omega}$ be a compact neighborhood of x. Then for n large

$$\varphi_n K \cap K' \neq \emptyset.$$

Then since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on $\widehat{\Omega}$ we see that the set $\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset G$ is relatively compact. Then, since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is closed, we can pass to a subsequence so that $\varphi_n \to \varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. Next let $k_n = \varphi_n^{-1} x_n$. By passing to another subsequence we can suppose that $k_n \to k \in K$. But then

$$x = \varphi k \in \Omega$$

and so we have a contradiction. $\square$

8. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Suppose M is a compact manifold and G is a connected semi-simple Lie group with trivial center and no compact factors. Let $P \leq G$ be a parabolic subgroup and let $\{(U_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a $(G, G/P)$-structure on M so that the image of the developing map is bounded in an affine chart.

Now $\Omega := \mathrm{dev}(\widetilde{M})$ is a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. By Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 7.1, $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a Lie group which acts properly on Ω. Now, by a result of Palais [Pal61], there exists a $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant Riemannian metric on Ω. At this point the rest of the argument follows the proof of Proposition 3.4.10 in [Thu97] verbatim.

9. Dual convexity and completeness

Suppose G is a non-compact connected simple Lie group with trivial center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Fix a parabolic subgroup $Q \leq G$ opposite to P.

Let $\Omega \subset G/P$ be a proper domain and define (as before)

$$\Omega^* := \{\xi \in G/Q : \xi \text{ is opposite to every } x \in \Omega\}.$$

Also given $\xi \in G/Q$ define (as before)

$$Z_\xi := \{x \in G/P : x \text{ is not opposite to } \xi\}.$$

Then $\xi \in \Omega^*$ if and only if $Z_\xi \cap \Omega = \emptyset$.

Now fix $P, Q \leq G$ opposite parabolic subgroups. Let $\tau : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be an irreducible representation, $\ell \subset V$ a line, and $H \subset V$ a hyperplane as in Theorem 4.6. Fix some $x_0 \in V$ so that $\mathbb{R}\, x_0 = \ell$ and fix some $f_0 \in V^*$ with $\ker f_0 = H$. Consider the dual representation $\tau^* : G \to \mathrm{PGL}(V^*)$. Now define the maps $\iota : G/P \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $\iota^* : G/Q \to \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ by

$$\iota(gP) = [\tau(g)x_0] \text{ and } \iota^*(gQ) = [\tau^*(g)f_0].$$

Then let C_Ω be the metric on Ω constructed in Section 5.

Theorem 9.1. *With the notation above,* (Ω, C_Ω) *is a complete metric space if and only if* Ω *is dual convex.*

Proof. Suppose that (Ω, C_Ω) is a complete metric space. Let

$$\widehat{\Omega} = \{x \in G/P : x \notin Z_\xi \text{ for all } \xi \in \Omega^*\}.$$

Since Ω^* is compact, $\widehat{\Omega}$ is open and $\Omega \subset \widehat{\Omega}$ by the definition of Ω^*. Moreover $(\widehat{\Omega})^* = \Omega^*$. Because Ω^* has non-empty interior, $\widehat{\Omega}$ is a bounded open set in an affine chart. Then the proof of Theorem 5.2 implies that $C_{\widehat{\Omega}}$ is a metric on $\widehat{\Omega}$

(notice that $\widehat{\Omega}$ may not be connected, but connectivity is not used in the proof of Theorem 5.2) and

$$C_\Omega = C_{\widehat{\Omega}}|_\Omega.$$

We claim that Ω coincides with a connected component of $\widehat{\Omega}$ which would imply that Ω is dual convex. Suppose not, then there exists some $x \in \partial\Omega \cap \widehat{\Omega}$. Pick a sequence $x_n \in \Omega$ so that $x_n \to x$. Then

$$C_\Omega(x_n, x_{n+m}) = C_{\widehat{\Omega}}(x_n, x_{n+m}) \leq C_{\widehat{\Omega}}(x_n, x) + C_{\widehat{\Omega}}(x, x_{n+m})$$

so x_n is a Cauchy sequence. But C_Ω is a complete metric and so $x \in \Omega$ which is a contradiction. Thus Ω is dual convex.

Now suppose that Ω is dual convex. We wish to show that C_Ω is a complete metric on Ω. Suppose that x_n is a Cauchy sequence, then by passing to a subsequence we can suppose that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} C_\Omega(x_i, x_{i+1}) = M < \infty.$$

Then

$$C_\Omega(x_n, x_1) \leq M$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Since G/P is compact we can pass to a subsequence so that $x_n \to x \in \overline{\Omega}$. We claim that $x \in \Omega$. Otherwise there exists some $\xi \in \Omega^*$ so that $x \in Z_\xi$. Since Ω is bounded in some affine chart we can find some $\eta \in \Omega^*$ so that $x \notin Z_\eta$. Then

$$C_\Omega(x_1, x_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \frac{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(x_1)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(x_n)\Big)}{\iota^*(\xi)\Big(\iota(x_n)\Big)\iota^*(\eta)\Big(\iota(x_1)\Big)} \right|.$$

But since $x \in Z_\xi$ the right hand side of the above expression goes to infinity as $n \to \infty$. Thus we have a contradiction and thus $x \in \Omega$. So C_Ω is a complete metric on Ω. □

We can now prove Theorem 1.12 from the introduction. The key step is the following variant of the Hopf-Rinow theorem:

Lemma 9.2. *Suppose (X, d) is a locally compact metric space and there exists a compact set $K \subset X$ such that $X = \mathrm{Isom}(X, d) \cdot K$. Then (X, d) is a complete metric space.*

Proof. We first claim that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $x \in X$ then set

$$B_X(x; \delta) := \{y \in X : d(x, y) \leq \delta\}$$

is compact. Since (X, d) is locally compact, for any $k \in K$ there exists $\delta_k > 0$ such that $B_X(k; \delta_k)$ is compact. Then since

$$K \subset \cup_{k \in K} \{y \in X : d(k, y) < \delta_k/2\}$$

there exists $k_1, \dots, k_N \in K$ such that

$$K \subset \cup_{i=1}^N \{y \in X : d(k_i, y) < \delta_{k_i}/2\}.$$

Then if $\delta := \min\{\delta_{k_i}/2\}$ we see that $B_X(x; \delta)$ is compact for any $x \in X$.

Now suppose that x_n is a Cauchy sequence in (X, d). Then there exists $N > 0$ such that $d(x_n, x_N) < \delta$ for $n > N$. But then there exists a subsequence x_{n_k} which converges. Thus (X, d) is complete. ☐

Now Theorem 9.1 and the above lemma imply:

Corollary 9.3. *Suppose G is a connected non-compact simple Lie group with trivial center, $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup, and $\Omega \subset G/P$ is a proper quasi-homogeneous domain. Then Ω is dual convex.*

References

[APS04] Mats Andersson, Mikael Passare, and Ragnar Sigurdsson. *Complex convexity and analytic functionals*, volume 225 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2004.

[BDL15] S. A. Ballas, J. Danciger, and G.-S. Lee. Convex projective structures on non-hyperbolic three-manifolds. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2015.

[Ben00] Yves Benoist. Automorphismes des cônes convexes. *Invent. Math.*, 141(1):149–193, 2000.

[Ben06] Yves Benoist. Convexes divisibles. IV. Structure du bord en dimension 3. *Invent. Math.*, 164(2):249–278, 2006.

[Ben08] Yves Benoist. A survey on divisible convex sets. In *Geometry, analysis and topology of discrete groups*, volume 6 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 1–18. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2008.

[Bow79] Rufus Bowen. Hausdorff dimension of quasicircles. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (50):11–25, 1979.

[CS14] Angel Cano and José Seade. On discrete groups of automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^2_{\mathbb{C}}$. *Geom. Dedicata*, 168:9–60, 2014.

[Dub09] Loïc Dubois. Projective metrics and contraction principles for complex cones. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 79(3):719–737, 2009.

[Ebe96] Patrick B. Eberlein. *Geometry of nonpositively curved manifolds*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1996.

[Fra89] Sidney Frankel. Complex geometry of convex domains that cover varieties. *Acta Math.*, 163(1-2):109–149, 1989.

[GGKW15a] F. Guéritaud, O. Guichard, F. Kassel, and A. Wienhard. Anosov representations and proper actions. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015.

[GGKW15b] F. Guéritaud, O. Guichard, F. Kassel, and A. Wienhard. Compactification of certain Clifford-Klein forms of reductive homogeneous spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2015.

[Gol88] William M. Goldman. Geometric structures on manifolds and varieties of representations. In *Geometry of group representations (Boulder, CO, 1987)*, volume 74 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 169–198. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988.

[Gol90] William M. Goldman. Convex real projective structures on compact surfaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 31(3):791–845, 1990.

[Gol15] William Goldman. Projective geometry on manifolds. 2015.

[GW08] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Convex foliated projective structures and the Hitchin component for $\mathrm{PSL}_4(\mathbf{R})$. *Duke Math. J.*, 144(3):381–445, 2008.

[GW12] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications. *Invent. Math.*, 190(2):357–438, 2012.

[Hör07] Lars Hörmander. *Notions of convexity*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2007. Reprint of the 1994 edition.

[IK99] A. V. Isaev and S. G. Krantz. Domains with non-compact automorphism group: a survey. *Adv. Math.*, 146(1):1–38, 1999.

[JM87] Dennis Johnson and John J. Millson. Deformation spaces associated to compact hyperbolic manifolds. In *Discrete groups in geometry and analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1984)*, volume 67 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 48–106. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1987.

[Kap07] Michael Kapovich. Convex projective structures on Gromov-Thurston manifolds. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:1777–1830, 2007.

[KLP13] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. Dynamics at infinity of regular discrete subgroups of isometries of higher rank symmetric spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2013.

[KLP14a] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. A Morse Lemma for quasigeodesics in symmetric spaces and euclidean buildings. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2014.

[KLP14b] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. Morse actions of discrete groups on symmetric space. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[KO80] Shoshichi Kobayashi and Takushiro Ochiai. Holomorphic projective structures on compact complex surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 249(1):75–94, 1980.

[Kob77] Shoshichi Kobayashi. Intrinsic distances associated with flat affine or projective structures. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 24(1):129–135, 1977.

[Kos68] J.-L. Koszul. Déformations de connexions localement plates. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 18(fasc. 1):103–114, 1968.

[Mar13] Ludovic Marquis. Around groups in hilbert geometry. In *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*. European Mathematical Society Publishing, to appear in 2013.

[Mos73] G. D. Mostow. *Strong rigidity of locally symmetric spaces*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1973. Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 78.

[Nag65] Tadashi Nagano. Transformation groups on compact symmetric spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 118:428–453, 1965.

[Pal61] Richard S. Palais. On the existence of slices for actions of non-compact Lie groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 73:295–323, 1961.

[Qui10] Jean-François Quint. Convexes divisibles (d'après Yves Benoist). *Astérisque*, (332):Exp. No. 999, vii, 45–73, 2010. Séminaire Bourbaki. Volume 2008/2009. Exposés 997–1011.

[Thu97] William P. Thurston. *Three-dimensional geometry and topology. Vol. 1*, volume 35 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. Edited by Silvio Levy.

[vLZ15] Wouter van Limbeek and Andrew M. Zimmer. Rigidity of convex divisible domains in flag manifolds. 2015.

[War72] Garth Warner. *Harmonic analysis on semi-simple Lie groups. I*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 188.

[Zim15] Andrew M. Zimmer. Characterizing the unit ball by its projective automorphism group. To appear in Geometry and Topology, 2015.